

In re Application of: Choi et al.
Application No. 10/672,095
Response to Office Action of September 28, 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 4-31 and 33-36 will be pending.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's withdrawal of the final Office Action dated August 16, 2007 and the issuance of the present non-final Office Action in view of the September 24, 2007 telephone conference between Applicants' representative and the undersigned.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0037747 to Ueno, of record, in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,771,896 to Tamura et al. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno and Tamura in further view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,792,293 to Awan et al. Furthermore, claims 10-23 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno in further view of Awan. Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno and Awan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,106,375 to Venturino et al., of record. Also, claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno and Tamura further view of Venturino. In addition, claims 33 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno and Tamura in further view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 7,158,266 to Kameyama, and claims 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno and Awan in further view of Kameyama.

These rejections are respectfully traversed. Specifically, as discussed in more detail below, the cited references, viewed individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a digital camera, or method of monitoring the status of a digital camera, that displays the initialization state of the communication interface of the camera. Awan, which is cited as allegedly teaching this feature, relates to a *cell phone*, not a camera and at best, teaches displaying the call status, not the *initialization state of the interface*.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 29-31

In this rejection, the Examiner admits that Ueno fails to teach displaying the progression

of the transceiving operation. However, for this feature, the Examiner relies on the teachings of Tamura pertaining to the displaying of the image printing as shown, for example, in Fig. 11c of Tamura. As indicated above, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the interface features of dependent claims 2 and 3, and independent claim 29 has been amended to include the interface features of dependent claim 32. However, nowhere does Ueno or Tamura teach or suggest displaying an initialization state of the communication interface of the camera as now recited in independent claim 1, or the operations of determining a type of the communication interface and displaying a message indicating the type of the communication interface as recited in amended independent claim 29.

Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is moot in view of the amendments.

The Rejection of Claim 3

In this rejection, the Examiner admits that Ueno and Tamura fail to teach or suggest the features relating to the interface as recited in dependent claim 3. However, for this feature, the Examiner relies on the teachings of Awan, and contends that one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to have modified the Ueno/Tamura apparatus to achieve the embodiment of the present invention as recited in this claim. Applicants respectfully disagree.

To begin, as indicated above, claim 3 was canceled, and its features are now present in independent claim 1. As discussed briefly above, Awan relates to a cellular telephone, not a camera. Granted, column 2, lines 1-2 state that “[g]eneral purpose monitors, video cameras and radios have dealt with the problem of upside-down viewing of a display.” However, Applicants respectfully submit that this teaching relates to the *orientation of the display*, not to displaying the *initialization state of an interface* of a camera. Furthermore, the Examiner states that Fig. 4A of Awan teaches this displaying of an initialization state of an interface. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 4A and its description in Awan merely relates to displaying a call status of a telephone. In other words, this display does not relate to the *initialization* of the interface itself, and the status of the call provides no indication of the status of the initialization of the interface (e.g., the interface could have been initialized during power up of the cell phone, and is now merely being operated to make the call).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious to employ features relating to a cell phone in a digital camera, and even if such

a combination were to be made, the combination would still fail to provide a display indicating the state of the *initialization* of the interface of the digital camera. Hence, amended independent claim 1, which includes the features of claim 3, should be allowable.

The Rejection of Claims 10-23 and 25-28

As in the rejection of claim 3, the Examiner contends that Awan teaches this displaying of an initialization state of an interface as recited in independent claims 10 and 14. However, as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 4A and its description in Awan merely relates to displaying a call status of a telephone.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious to employ features relating to a cell phone in a digital camera, and even if such a combination were to be made, the combination would still fail to provide a display indicating the state of the initialization of the interface of the digital camera. Hence, amended independent claims 10 and 14, and all dependent claims, should be allowable.

The Rejections of Dependent claims 24 and 32-36

Applicants respectfully submit that for reasons similar to those discussed above, dependent claim 24 and 33-35 should be allowable at least for their dependency on independent claims 1, 17 or 17. Applicants submit that the teachings of Venturino and Kameyama fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Ueno, Tamura and Awan as discussed above.

With regard to claim 32, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim has been canceled and its features have been added to independent claim 29 and thus, this rejection is moot. Concerning the Venturino reference which was cited against claim 32, Applicants respectfully submit that Venturino does not teach or suggest determining the type of *communication interface* and then displaying the type of *communication interface*. At best, the memory card taught by Venturino can be viewed, for purposes of this discussion, as an external device, not a type of communication interface. It is noted that amended claim 29 recites an external device *and* a communication interface. The terms “CF” and “SD” referred to by the Examiner pertain to the type of memory cards (e.g., external devices), not a type of communication interface.

In re Application of: Choi et al.
Application No. 10/672,095
Response to Office Action of September 28, 2007

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, dependent claim 24, amended independent claim 29, and dependent claims 33-36, should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
One of Attorneys for Applicant(s)
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One of Attorneys for Applicant(s)
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: December 20, 2007

CH02/ 22504587.1